DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 127 CS 002 279

AUTHOR Kurzman, Maurice
TITLE Readability of Freshmen College Textbooks in the Social Sciences as Compared to the Reading Ability of Students Who Use Them. A Pilot Study.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, Bronx, N.Y. Herbert H. Lehman Coll.
PUB DATE Aug 73
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Higher Education; History Textbooks; *Readability; *Reading Ability; Reading Research; *Social Sciences; *Textbook Evaluation; Textbook Research; Textbook Standards
IDENTIFIERS Nelson Denny Reading Test

ABSTRACT

The subjects for this study were 81 freshman students who were taking courses in the social sciences at Herbert H. Lehman College in New York. A Nelson Denny Reading Test showed their average reading grade level to be 10.4 Twenty-three books in the social science areas were selected for appraisal, using such procedures as the application of a readability formula for ascertaining the reading grade level of the books and the estimation of the relative difficulty of the books by the students using them. The grade level placements of the textbooks were obtained from the Smog formula, the estimates of two reading teachers, and the estimates of the instructors whose books were being used. It was concluded that only four of the twenty-four books were on the freshman level. Of the remaining twenty books, seven were on the fourteenth level, five were on the fifteenth grade level, six were on the sixteenth level, and two were on the seventeenth level. It was recommended that a coordinated effort be made to help these students by developing a full year's course of special help in reading and study skills and that instructors use supplementary aids for teaching the subject matter. (TS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116127

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
The City University of New York
Bedford Park Boulevard West
Bronx, New York 10468

READABILITY OF FRESHMEN COLLEGE TEXTBOOKS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AS COMPARED TO THE READING ABILITY OF STUDENTS WHO USE THEM

A PILOT STUDY

Maurice Kurzman

Department of Academic Skills

August, 1973

CS 003 879

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION 1

DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND PROCEDURES 3

RESULTS OF THE STUDY 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 16

APPENDIX 21

BIBLIOGRAPHY 27

PREFACE

The New York Times (July 15,1973) described how in 1970, the City University of New York changed its admission policy and opened its doors to all graduating high school seniors in the city,regardless of their scholastic record. Many were admitted who were lacking in a number of skills necessary to cope successfully with college level courses. Large numbers had to be given special assistance and special courses to overcome deficiencies in their precollege preparation and background.

For such students,because of the heavy reading load usually expected of them, the readability of the textbooks assigned to them becomes a matter of great concern. This study was undertaken to find out how the reading ability of these students compares with the readability of their textbooks. More important, it was undertaken to explore what could be done to help the students who have reading and study skills deficiencies to handle the difficult assignments with some measure of success.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Mrs. Cash and Mrs. Spears of the Reading Department for their valuable assistance in giving their expert appraisals of the textbooks. I am greatly indebted to the various Social Science Instructors who submitted their estimates. I would like to give special thanks to Professor Harold Abelson and Professor Edward Frankel of the Education Department who helped with the design of the project. Thanks also to Dean James F. Light who made a grant available so that clerical work involved could be done.

INTRODUCTION

A number of studies have been made recently comparing the reading ability of college students with the r adability of their textbooks.

A study by Major and Collette (1961) had found that in a nation-wide survey of college general biology textbooks that the most frequently used and preferred texts were written beyond the reading comprehension level of college freshmen. Creamer (1968) found that while the students in a rural community college had an average reading ability on the 8th grade level, the textbooks they were using averaged between grade levels 14 and 16. Gibson (1971) reported that Nelson Denny Reading Test scores of a sample of 200 California community college students indicated that 65% had poor reading ability, 24% average, and 11% superior, with informal reading inventory results indicating that over half were reading at frustration level. McClellen (1971) compared reading levels (Nelson Denny) of Hillsborough Junior College students in four Social Science area classes and one English class with readability levels of twenty selected texts indicating that less than 30 per cent of students enrolled in the college would be able to read their texts. Of the twenty texts analyzed, eight had readability level scores of 16+. Of these eight texts, three were selected for use by students in

remedial type courses! Terry A. Cline (1972) made a study of the reading ability of students in a community college in Missouri. He compared their reading levels with the readability of the textbooks which they were using. He found that the average reading level of the students involved,as determined by the Nelson Denny Reading Test,was at the 12.6 grade level. The readability of the seventeen textbooks selected for the study was determined by the Dale-Chall Readability Formula. The results showed that 52% of the students in the classes using the books had reading abilities below the grade level placement of the textbooks. Seven of the textbooks were above the reading abilities of at least 75% of the students in the corresponding classes. Thus,even though the students had an average reading ability probably higher than that for most community colleges, their text books were in most cases much too difficult for them to handle.

To ascertain whether a similar disparity between readability of texts and the reading ability of their users existed at a New York City college, a similar survey was undertaken in the Fall of 1972 at H.H. Lehman, a Senior college located in the Bronx, New York.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Prior to their entrance to H.H. Lehman College in the Fall of 1972, Freshmen were given the American College Test. The test showed that many of the students were below 13th grade (Freshman level) in reading ability with scores ranging from below 7th grade to over 14th grade. Those who scored below the 20%ile were assigned to take a special one-year course in reading and study skills given by the Academic Skills Department.

A textbook questionnaire was submitted to these special students during the second month of the semester. See Appendix (A).

On the basis of their answers, 23 books in the Social Science area were selected for appraisal. They were books dealing with History, Anthropology, Black History, Sociology, Economics and Political Science. The books which were being used by at least three of the students in the selected group are shown in Appendix (B).

Subjects

The selected group were some 81 students who were taking courses in the Social Sciences. A Nelson Denny Reading Test showed their average reading grade level to be 10.4. The distribution of their reading scores is shown in Table I. This group was fairly representative of the other students assigned to the Reading Department for an examination of the scores of some 200 other students showed an average reading

grade level of 10.5 and a similar range from below 7th grade up to 14th grade reading level. The 81 students then were at least two years on the average below acceptable college reading level ability. That this is not unusual is indicated by a study by Halfter and Douglass (1958) who after a careful eight year study concluded that two thirds of their entering college freshmen lacked reading skills required for academic success. Also Hadley (1957) estimated that 95 per cent of college entrants lack adequate study skills and that a relatively small percent have reading speeds and comprehension skills adequate for preparation of their college assignments.

Table I Nelson Denny Scores of Students in the Study

Reading Grade Levels	No. of Students
Below 7	2
7 - 7.4	3
7.5 - 7.9	3
8.0 - 8.4	3
8.5 - 8.9	6
9.0 - 9.4	10
9.5 - 9.9	13
10.0 - 10.4	6
10.5 - 10.9	7
11.0 - 11.4	6
11.5 - 11.9	3
12.0 - 12.4	6
12.5 - 12.9	7
13.0 - 13.4	3
13.5 - 13.9	3
14.0 - 14.4	1
14.5 - 14.9	0
	N = 81

Median - 10.0 Mean - 10.4 Mode - 9.7

PROCEDURES

Appraisal of the Textbooks

To appraise the textbooks used by the subjects, the following procedures were used:

1. Application of a readability formula for ascertaining the reading grade level of the books.

2. An estimation by two Reading Specialists of the reading level of the texts.

3. An estimation by the Instructors in the Social Science classes of the readability of their books.

4. An estimation of the relative difficulty of the books by the students using them.

5. An analysis by the Social Science Instructors of other aspects of readability besides grade level.

Readability Grading of Textbooks

A number of formulas have been used in various studies of readability over the years. Some of the most popular have been the Lorge (1944), the Dale-Chall (1948), the Flesch (1948), the Gunning (1952) and the Fry (1968). It is not within the scope of this study to discuss the reliability or the validity of these various formulas. This has been done quite well by George R. Klare in his Measurement of Readability (1963).

Recently, Dr. G.H. McLaughlin, Professor of Communications at Syracuse University devised a readability measure which he called the Smog Grading Formula (in tribute, he remarked, to Gunning's Fog Index) (1969). Certain features of the formula prompted the writer to make use of it for this study. According to McLaughlin, the Smog Formula has cer-

tain positive advantages over the other formulas in the field:

1. It is a simple formula and easy to apply.

2. It saves time, taking only about nine minutes to derive a grade level for reading material.

3. It uses a much larger sample (600) words instead of the 100 or 200 words used in other formulas.

4. It is more valid than some of the other formulas for the derived grade level is that which a reader needs to insure complete comprehension rather than the grade at which a book or article can be read with understanding.

5. The formula takes into account both semantic and syntactic difficulties and their interaction - a fact which previous investigators seem to have overlooked.

The method for using this formula is given in Appendix (C).

Appraisal of Textbooks by Specialist and Instructors

Statistically speaking, the formulas are not too accurate. McLaughlin, for example, points out that the standard error of the predictions given by his formula is about 1.5 grades. That is, the formula will predict the grade of a passage accurately within one and a half grades in 65% of the cases.

There are many other shortcomings and inadequacies of readability formulas. They are mechanical and do not measure abstract ideas contained in passages nor their density. They do not take into account matters of typography nor the impact of pictures, illustrations, diagrams and other non-prose materials. They do not measure the way material is organized for facilitating learning. They pay no attention to style nor vividness nor topicality of expression. More important still, they do not take into account the interaction of the reader and the material - matters of previous experience, motivation, interest, attitudes, and the like. In short, they do not measure the equipment which the reader brings to the book.

It became necessary, therefore, to find other additional means for appraising the readability of the textbooks. Two Reading teachers from the Academic Skills Department and the instructors in the Social Science Department whose books were being used were asked to assess the textbooks, using a five point scale devised by the writer. The Guidelines are shown in Appendices (D & E).

The Reading teachers were also asked to appraise the textbooks on other aspects of readability besides grade level. The Social Science instructors were likewise asked to supply additional information about the suitability of the textbooks from the point of view of their curricular objectives and their knowledge of the students' abilities.

Appraisal by Students

On the textbook survey to be answered by the students, there was room also for them to record their estimates of the relative difficulty of their books. See Appendix (F). It should be noted that since the survey was taken during the second month of the semester, that the students could not have completed their books and thus could not give a complete nor competent judgment on this matter of relative difficulty. Many other factors also would have to be considered here before their judgments could be called valid. However, it was thought worthwhile to record their opinions and to note how they corresponded with the other estimates.

RESULTS

1. The readability levels of the twenty three Social Science textbooks, according to the Smog Grading formula, ranged from 13th grade (Freshman level) to 18th grade (Graduate school level). Five of the books were on 13th grade level, four on 14th grade, six on 15th grade, three on 16th grade, four on 17th grade and two on 18th grade. The Smog gradings are shown below. The books are listed by authors. Full titles are listed in Appendix B.

Table II - Smog Gradings

1. Carraty	15	13. McNall (1)	15.5
2. Morgan	14	14. McNall (2)	13
3. Iriye	13	15. Chinoy	15.5
4. Kolko	18	16. DeFleur	16
5. Rozwene	16	17. Spencer	14
6. Ostrander	16	18. Samuelson	15.5
7. Quint	17	19. Heilbroner	13
8. Paden (1)	17	20. Taylor	14
9. Paden (2)	18	21. Spradley	15
10. Paden (3)	-	22. Richards	13
11. Thompson	17	23. Greenstein	17
12. Boehen	13	24. Dahl	15.5

2. The two Reading Specialists' estimates of readability showed a range of grade levels from 13 up to 17. Three of the books were estimated to be on 13th grade level, seven on 14th grade, eight on 15th grade, three

on 16th grade and one on 17th grade.

3. The Social Science instructors' estimates of readability ranged from grade 10.5 up to 16th grade. Only eleven books were appraised so that the results here are incomplete and inconclusive. The tendency seems to be for the instructors to assign much lower readability ratings to their textbooks. One book was rated on a 10th grade level, three on a 12th grade level, three on a 13th grade level, two on a 14th, one on a 15th and one on a 16th.

4. The readability levels of the textbooks obtained from the three different sources, namely, the Smog Grading, the Reading Teachers' estimates and the Instructors' estimates, are shown on Table III below. The last column averages the estimates from the different sources. It shows a range of grades from 13 up to 17. Four books were on 13th grade level, seven books were on 14th grade level, five books were on 15th grade level, six books were on 16th grade and two books were on 17th grade level. Thus, all the textbooks were on college level grade. Only four of the twenty four were on freshman level.

The grade level placements of the textbooks as obtained from the Smog formula, the Reading teachers' estimates and the Instructors' estimates are summarized in Table IV.

TABLE III

Readability Grade Levels

Book	Reading Teachers' Estimate	Smog Formula	Instructors' Estimate	Average Estimate
1	14	15	12	14
2	15	14	12	14
3	14	13	N.A.*	13.5
4	14.5	18	N.A.	16.5
5	14.5	16	N.A.	15.5
6	13.5	16	N.A.	15.5
7	15	17	N.A.	16
8	17	17	16.5	17
9	16.5	18	14	16.5
10	16.5	18	14	16.5
11	16.5	17	N.A.	17
12	N.A.	13	15	14
13	16	15.5	N.A.	16
14	14.5	13	12.5	13
15	13.5	15.5	10.5	13
16	15	16	15	15
17	15	14	13	14
18	15	15.5	N.A.	15
19	15.5	13	13	14
20	14	14	N.A.	14
21	15.5	15	N.A.	15
22	14	13	13.5	13.5
23	15	17	N.A.	16
24	13.5	15.5	N.A.	14.5

* Not Available

TABLE IV

Number of Books at Different Grade Levels

Grade	Reading Teachers' Estimate	Smog Formula	Instructors' Estimate
10	0	0	1
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	3
13	3	5	3
14	7	4	2
15	8	6	1
16	3	3	1
17	1	4	0
18	0	2	0
Total	22	24	11

5. The Social Science instructors who handed in their appraisals gave other information in addition to their estimates of the readability of the books. As was noted in Table IV above, they had tended to give lower gradings to the textbooks than had the Reading teachers or the Smog formula. However, many of them wrote that they were not too well satisfied with the books they were using. Obviously, they were reacting to the fact that the books could not be handled easily by many of their students. Some comments by different instructors are quoted below:

1. "Due to lack of depth in the presentation of materials in the basic text, I had to use other books. The book woefully failed to achieve the objective of the course."

2. "Most of the material was so superficial that I had to supplement with lectures and refer to other

texts. On the whole, continued reliance on the book would have defeated the objective of the course."

3. "The book is useful because assigned readings generate a lot of interesting discussions."

4. "These two books are used as supplementary texts which are integrated with a third book as well as my lectures. The articles in the third book are used as a basis for my discussion groups."

5. "I found the books were useful for only some sections of the course. Selections from the two texts are now part of the supplementary reading assignments and [illegible] required reading."

6. "Both the textbooks and assigned essays are used as a source for examinations."

7. "The book turned off the students and I no longer use it."

8. "I worry about the problem of readability when I assign supplementary reading."

9. "If I found a text that was more interesting and clear, I'd change. I hope I will."

10. "There are many questions other than readability to worry about in getting my message across."

11. "I found that the books were useful for only some sections of the course and that for many students the books were difficult. I suggested, therefore, that the students use other books."

12. "On the whole, I think it will be very difficult for freshmen to comprehend most of the material. The book was too verbose, very superficial and incomprehensible. I had to use other books."

13. "The book serves the objectives of the course rather well but not for those with reading problems."

14. "As an introduction it has flaws because it is too terse and therefore heavy and not as readable as it could be. I use other materials which I generally prefer to the texts."

6. An appraisal of the relative difficulty of the textbooks by teachers and students was also obtained. The difficulty of the texts was scored on a 5 point scale which asked for estimates ranging from "very easy" to "very difficult". The results are listed in Table V below.

Table V - Summary of Ratings on Relative Difficulty of Comprehension of Texts

Category	Students' Estimates	Reading Teachers' Estimates
	No. of Books	
VERY EASY	0	0
Very Easy to Easy	0	0
EASY	0	0
Easy to Average	6	1
AVERAGE	4	4
Average to Difficult	10	8
DIFFICULT	1	8
Difficult to Very Difficult	2	1
VERY DIFFICULT	0	0
	23	22

The students' estimates were averaged as were the estimates of the two reading teachers. The correlation between the two estimates was found to be -.25. This is a small negative correlation showing that the teachers' estimates tend to be slightly the opposite of how the students regard their books. In general, the students thought their books were not as difficult to understand as the reading teachers estimated them to be. It should be noted that the students estimates are simply reflections of their sub-

jective feelings. They were not given any instructions on how to arrive at their judgments. The Reading teachers, on the other hand, were asked to base their estimates of difficulty on such factors as style, typography, organization of material and density of concepts before coming to a conclusion about the ease of comprehensibility of the text.

7. Correlation studies between the different estimations showed the following:

The correlation between the Smog ratings and the Reading Teachers' estimates was .69. This shows that there is a good or dependable correlation between these two methods for getting an objective appraisal of the readability of textbooks.

The correlation between the Smog formula and the Social Science teachers' estimates (where available) was found to be .39. This is a low correlation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study confirms the findings of many other studies dealing with the problem. According to this study, the Social Science textbooks used by a group of college freshmen were in most cases many grade levels above their reading ability. For use in self-study, which is one of the main objectives of a college education, the textbooks were found to be too difficult for many of the students to comprehend adequately or properly.

To meet this problem, two somewhat different approaches have been used - one by the Social Science instructors and the other by the Reading instructors in the Academic Skills Department.

The Social Science instructors, although they had a number of adverse criticisms, in general, felt that the books they were using were not too difficult to be handled by most of their students and that the books were suitable for their course objectives. Here it must be noted that their classes are comprised of other students besides those who were selected for the study. The Academic Skills students are only a part of the whole Freshman class - those who were below the 20 percentile in reading ability. The teachers were considering their classes as a whole rather than just the special students of the study.

Furthermore, those instructors who are aware of the difficulties inherent in the book and of the lack of reading ability of the students, will usually resort to other methods of instruction. Through lectures, class discussions,

supplementary aids and other pedagogical methods, the instructor may help the students to understand the material in the textbook. He may use motivational devices, guidance, and organized presentations to interest and assist the student to understand the work. In many instances, the basic text is used very little in the course. The instructor may make use of many other communication media for teaching the subject matter. He will use monographs, periodicals, essays, abstracts, films and other supplementary aids to teach rather than depend on the basic text. In other words, he will try to bring the content of the material down to the level of the student's ability to comprehend.

The Reading teachers have a different approach. They work on the assumption that a student should be helped to cope with the reading material in his courses whenever a low reading ability is shown. In line with this, the Reading Department has laid out a full year's course of special help in reading and study skills with special emphasis on reading in the content areas.

It is recommended that a coordinated effort be made to use both approaches. The emphasis in Reading courses should be not only on general reading and study skills but on aids to comprehension of the specific texts which the students are using in their content courses. This fact has been noted and proper application is being made in the Reading syllabus.

Many of the reading and study skills taught by the Reading Department can also be taught by the instructors in the content areas. They should be aware of the reading abilities of their students. They should be knowledgeable about how the reading process works and be able to explain proper reading procedures in making textbook assignments. Information along these lines can be obtained from the Reading Department. An in-service course for interested instructors could be arranged.

The Reading Department can also supply information about the level of a student's reading ability. The American College Test scores of all freshmen should also be made available. These reading scores would be most helpful to an instructor who wished to individualize his teaching, make proper assignments, use supplementary texts, or select the best basic text for his purposes.

The Smog formula seems to be a good objective measure of the readability levels of textbooks. It is easy to apply and would help in making decisions about proper books to be used in particular courses. The Reading Department would also be able to furnish appraisals upon request.

A recent full day conference held between the Reading Department and the History Department high-lighted the need for a joint approach to the problem of meeting the reading needs of the students. One plan which turned out to be very productive was to use team-teaching in a History class. A teacher from each of the departments combined their

expertise to teach a history course. This may be one answer on how to help students with their history reading problems. Meetings with other departments along similar lines would be highly desirable.

This study leads to the conclusion that without special assistance on the part of the instructor, without special efforts to improve reading skills, or without high motivation on the part of the student, the disparity between the reading ability of the student and the readability of their texts can only lead to frustration.

This frustration may be the major factor in the large percentage of drop-outs from college and is especially true for students who have less than average reading ability.

As reported in the New York Times (July 15,1973) City University officials had recently compiled data showing that 51% of the Open Admission students and 30% of the Regular Admission students dropped out of the Senior colleges. In the Community Colleges 59% of the Open Admission students and 52% of the Regular Admission students dropped out. A study by the American Council on Education, the University Research Corporation, and two Lehman College sociologists, D. Lavin and B. Jacobson found that these drop-out rates were generally similar to those for higher education institutions on a nation-wide scale.

If then, as the writer believes, one of the major causes of these drop-outs lies in the inability of many of the students to cope with their reading materials, does it

then not become necessary to take a long hard look at the products that textbook writers are dispensing? Since large sums of money are being spent on the purchase of materials which are incomprehensible to large proportions of intended users, serious attention should be given to the readability levels of the textbooks which publishers are putting out for college use. Increasing attention should be given to readability research with the object of developing technology necessary for adjusting materials to suit the abilities of the students who use them. Finally, the Faculties of various departments should review their methods of textbook selection and place readability high on the list of criteria.

APPENDIX

(A) STUDENT TEXTBOOK SURVEY

Name_____ Section_____

Instructor_____

1. For all the textbooks you are using this term (hard or softcover) give 1) Full title 2) Author 3) Publisher 4) Edition 5) Copyright date

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

2. For each textbook write the course in which it is being used and the instructor's name:

	Name of Book	Course	Instructor
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

HISTORY

1. American Nation - John A. Garraty, Harper & Row, Vol 1, Vol 11, 2nd Ed.
2. Puritan Dilemma - Edmund S. Morgan, Little Brown, 1958
3. Across the Pacific - Akira Iriye, Harcourt Brace & World, N. Y. , 1959
4. Roots of American Foreign Policy - Gabriel Kolko, Beacon Paper Press, 5th Ed., 1972
5. Restless Americans - Rozwene, Martin and Sandler, Vol 11, Xerox Corp., 1972
6. Profile History of the United States - Gilman M. Ostrander, McGraw Hill Book Co., 2nd Ed., 1972
7. Main Problems in American History - Howard Quint, Cantor, Albertson, Dorsey Press, 2 Vol, 3rd Ed, 1972

BLACK HISTORY

8. African Experience, Vol 1-John N. Paden & Edward W.Soja, Northwestern Unviersity Press, 2nd Ed., 1970
9. African Experience, Vol 2-John N. Paden & Edward W. Soja, Northwestern University Press, 2nd Ed., 1970
10. African Experience, Vol 3- John N. Paden & Edward W. Soja, Northwestern University Press, 2nd Ed., 1970
11. African Unity - V. B. Thompson, T. Longman, 1971
12. Topics in West African History - A. Boahen; Longman Group Inc., London, 1966, American Distribution, Humanities

SOCIOLOGY

13. Sociological Perspective - Scott G. McNall, Little Brown & Co., 2nd Ed., 1971
14. Sociological Experience - Scott G. McNall, Little Brown & Co., 2nd Ed., 1971
15. Sociological Perspective - E. Chinoy, Random House, 1968
16. Sociology: Man in Society - B. De Fleur, Scott Foresman

ECONOMICS

17. Contemporary Economics - Miton H. Spencer, Worth, Publ., 1st Ed., 1971
18. Economics - Paul A. Samuelson, McGraw Hill, N.Y., 8th Ed., 1970
19. Economic Problems - Robert L. Heilbroner, Prentic Hall 3rd Ed., 1972

ANTHROPOLOGY

20. Cultural Ways - R.B. Taylor, James P. Spradley & David McCurdy, Allyn & Baron, 1969
21. Conformity and Conflict - Spradley and McCurdy Little Brown 1971
22. Man in Perspective - Cara E. Richards, Random House, N.Y. 1971

POLITICAL SCIENCE

23. American Party System - Fred L. Greenstein- Prentice Hall 2nd Ed., 1970
24. Democracy in United States- Promise and Performance- Robert A. Dahl: Rand McNally Co., 1972

(C) Outline of SMOG Grading Formula.

1. Count 10 consecutive sentences near the beginning of the text to be assessed, 10 in the middle and 10 near the end. Count as a sentence any string of words ending with a period, question mark or exclamation point.

2. In the selected sentences count every word of three or more syllables. Any string of letters or numerals beginning and ending with a space or punctuation mark should be counted if you can distinguish at least three syllables when you read it aloud in context. If a polysyllabic word is repeated, count each repetition.

3. Estimate the square root of the number of polysyllabic words counted. This is done by taking the square root of the nearest perfect square. For example, if the count is 95, the nearest perfect square is 100, which yields a square root of 10. If the count lies roughly between two perfect squares, choose the lower number.

4. Add 3 to the approximate square root. This gives the SMOG Grade, which is the reading grade that a person must have reached if he is to understand fully the text assessed.

(D) Guide for Reading Teachers
in Assessing Readability of Textbooks.

Directions: Below are listed 6 specific criteria and an overall estimate of readability of textbooks. Kindly rate each according to the extent you think the treatmen in the contributes to or detracts from the readability of the book.

I. A. Polysyllabic words (words with 3 or more syllables) per 30 sentences.

150 Very many 120 many 100 average 60 few 30 very few

B. Complexity of sentences. (Many subordinate clauses) per 30 sentences.

25 Very many 20 many 15 average 10 few 5 very few

C. Style (interesting vivid presentation, colorful language, familiar or relevant terms and references, clear development)

__Very good __good ___average ___ ___poor ___very poor

D. Density (many concepts packed together, frequency of difficult, abstract or technical terms or concepts per page)

__Very many ___many ___average few ___very few

E. Typography(comfortable type, good format, lines not too long, no glare, good illustrations, non-prose materials attractive, well-labelled.

__Very good __good ___average ___poor __very poor

F. Organization for learning(chapter subtopics, marginal notes, summaries, reviews, outlines, glossary, index, illustrations, clear definitions, logical development)

__ Very good __good ___average __poor ___very poor

II. General Estimate of Readability

A. __Very difficult __difficult __average __easy ___very easy

B. Estimated grade level (for complete understanding or comprehension)

-7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16+

Name of Book and Author

Reader's Name

(E) Guide for Content Area Teachers in Evaluating Textbooks.

Directions: Please evaluate textbooks for each of the categories listed.

I. Readability - see Reading Teachers' Guide

II. Level of difficulty - How difficult do you estimate the book might be for Freshmen of average reading ability to understand fully the textual material?

___Very difficult ___difficult ___average difficulty ___easy ___very easy.

III. Suitability - Please expand on the following questions:

1. Why do you use this particular book?
2. How do you use this book?
   (regular assignments, as a supplementary text, tie-in with lectures, questions from textbook, book reports, source for test material, etc., etc.)
3. How well does this book serve the purposes or objectives of your course?

Title of Book _____

Reader's Name _____

(F) Student Textbook Survey (2)

Name_____

3. For each textbook put a check in the proper column for what you consider the ease of understanding the book

Name of Book	Very Difficult	Difficult	Average Difficulty	Easy	Very Easy
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, Chas. M. and Adams, W. Royce How to Read the Social Sciences. Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois, 1968.

Buder, Leonard "50% Drop Out Under Open Admissions" The New York Times July 15,1973, 40.

Cline, Terry A. "Readability of Community College Textbooks." Journal of Reading, Oct., 1972, 33-37.

Creamer, W.A. "A Comparison of the Readability of Community College Textbooks with the Students Who Use Them." Unpublished manuscript, Gloucester County College, Sewell, New Jersey, 1968.

Gibson, W.D. "Relationship Between Difficulty Levels of Assigned English Texts and Reading Ability of Community College Students" Dissertation Abstracts International, June 1971,31.

Hadley, L.S. "New College Students Lack Study Techniques" School and Society, 1959, 85,363.

Halfter, I.T., and Douglass, F.M. "Inadequate College Readers", Journal of Developmental Reading, 1958, 1,42.

Herber, Harold L. Teaching Reading in Context Areas. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1970.

Johnson, Roger E. and Vardian Eileen B. Reading, Readability and Social Studies, The Reading Teacher, Feb. 1973, 483-488.

Klare, George R. The Measurement of Readability. Iowa State University, 1963.

Major, A.G. and Collette, A.T. "Readability of College General Biology Textbooks." Science Education 45 (1961) 216-24

McClellan, Dorinda A. "Reading Ability of Junior College Students and Readability of Assigned Texts" Twentieth Yearbook of National Reading Conference F.P. Greene (Ed) Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1971. 348-353.

McLaughlin, Harry G. "Smog Grading - a New Readability Formula". Journal of Reading, May, 1969, 639 -646.